KAZAK SOCIAL GROUPS IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC LIFE

NOMADIC UNITS

621 In considering the economic aspects of the uru group as a functioning unit we encounter a new term, aul. Roughly it is possible to say that the aul was co-extensive with the uru in the sense of a group living together. One of my informants in the initial stages of a discussion of this point said "the aul is an uru and the uru is an aul." This, however, was no doubt an oversimplification for the benefit of the ignorant but curious ethnologist, because further [61] inquiry reveals one fundamental distinction. The members of an uru were all blood relatives in the male line, or assumed to be such, while an aul might contain various individuals from outside the blood group. A man might change his aul simply by going to live in another, but could not change his uru. In the old days, according to Kargabaiev, they corresponded closely because then it was very unusual to go and live among strangers. In any case it appears that a majority of the members of an aul would be members of the same uru.

The aul may be defined as a "mobile village"[1] or nomadic encampment. Here again, however, the problem of subdivisions appears because the term aul is applied by different writers to groups of differing magnitudes. As will be explained in more detail later, it was customary for the uru group and its alien associate members who passed the winter living as a compact unit to split up with the coming of spring into smaller groups for the pasturage of their herds. These smaller groups consisted of perhaps half a dozen kibitkas, usually belonging to one family, while half a mile or a mile away would be another such group of kibitkas, with numerous other similar clusters of habitations scattered over the whole area customarily occupied by the uru group. The point at issue is whether the single clusters may be called auls or whether all the diffused and scattered camps taken as a whole constituted an aul.

My informants used the word in the latter sense. According to Tlenshiev the small group of five to ten kibitkas would not be an aul but an yj (family or house). An aul would normally consist of several hundred kibitkas. This is also the sense in which Kargabaiev used the word. His aul was named Karastaq ("black place," i.e., where the snow never lies) and comprised about 500 kibitkas and approximately 3,000 people. It is interesting to note here that the name of his aul was not the same as that of his uru, Davlet. Usually, however, the two seem to have been the same, the aul taking on the name of the uru to which the majority of its members belonged, which was, as explained above, the personal name of its traditional founder. In this case, however, Karastaq is a place name which had been adopted by the aul.

According to Grodekov the average aul comprised about 300 kibitkas but the number

[1] Levshin, *Description des hordes*, 312.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

might vary from fifty to a thousand or more.[3] Radlov, however, says[4] that the aul consisted of six to ten families, and Lansdell[5] estimates ten in the Orenburg region but frequently fifteen or more farther south. Levshin is noncommittal and remarks[6] that the number of tents comprising an aul "... depends upon circumstances." Vladimirtsov,[7] in dealing with Mongol material, contrasts the aul (Mongol: ayil) manner of migration in small groups to an earlier practice of migrating in units of several hundred kibitkas, but one must be wary of assuming that similar terms in Mongol and Kazak mean the same thing.

In general it seems likely that the term aul does not apply to any definitely fixed group but signifies any kind of encampment. The size of these encampments varied considerably with the seasonal round in the economic life of the Kazak, which we may now consider.

SEASONAL VARIATIONS

There were three important periods in the yearly cycle of Kazak economy, corresponding roughly to summer, autumn and winter.

Summer (çaz) was the period of pasturage on the open ranges, involving journeys from one pasture to the next as the first became exhausted. In some places also this was the time at which hay was gathered as winter fodder for the herds. Autumn (kyz) when the shearing (kyzem) of the sheep took place, was the busiest period of the year for most Kazak. It was also the time to make preparations for winter, to finish storing away the hay, to repair the roof and walls of the winter habitation and, among those groups which had agriculture, to harvest the crops. The winter season (qŀs) was one of comparative rest and relaxation.

The dates for beginning the migration to summer pastures varied with the locality, the climatic conditions of the particular year, and the habits of the group. Generally it was about the end of May or beginning of June. This was the case with Tlenshiev's group in the Uralsk region and also with Kargabaiev's in the vicinity of Alma-ata. Rudenko writes of the Kazak in the southern foothills of the Altai:[7] "Some leave at the first show of green but most in the latter part of May or first of June.... The wealthy start earlier than the poor people." Kuftin however says:[8]

> The Kazak of the northern districts move out during the second half of March, but in the south at the end of February or beginning of March because of the necessity of passing the barren sandy tracts before hot weather while the steppes are still covered with fresh vegetation and there are no spiders and insects to harass the cattle.

[3] Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 147.
[4] Radlov, *Aus Sibirien*, 1: 513.
[5] Lansdell, *Russian Central Asia*, 319.
[6] *Description des hordes*, 312.
[7] *Obshchestvennyi Stroĭ*, 37.
[7] Rudenko, *Ocherk Byta ... Kazakov*, 4.
[8] *Kirgiz-Kazaki*, 21–23.

from winter quarters; they prepared the ground, sowed the crops and then departed, leaving the poorer members of the group to keep watch over the planted lands until their return for the harvest.

The difficulty of determining what should be considered the migratory unit has been suggested in the discussion above of the nature of the aul. According to Kargabaiev the Davlet uru and other people living with them, forming together the Karastaq aul, were divided during the period of summer pasturage into groups of five or six related families who set up their kibitkas in one place when they camped and moved together from one part to another of the whole area traditionally utilized by the Davlet uru. He explained that when he had said previously that they only journeyed 9 kilometers to summer pastures he meant it was 9 kilometers from the common winter quarters to the beginning of the upland pastures where they separated into smaller groups.

Such was apparently the condition described by Grodekov[15] in writing, "They migrated as a society of one gens [Russian: rod] but admitted to the aul individuals from other gentes related through the mother's line and also poor people hired as workers. The routes of migration were fixed for each gens which had its designated place for summer and autumn." Then, a few lines later, "They migrate in groups of a greater or less number of kibitkas." The first statement seems to refer to the uru as it may be considered a migratory unit, and the second to its component parts of family groups. A further statement emphasizes this point.[16] "In summer they live more in scattered groups; in winter more compactly. If they lived too closely together in summer there would be an inadequacy of pasture and the cattle would become mixed up."

The small family groups, in theory at least, might camp anywhere convenient for them in the general area occupied by the uru and remain as long as they liked. Grodekov states[17] that the master of each kibitka started out and halted when he wished. The leaders of the uru, the aqsaqal " . . . or, according to some, the rich men, suggest, but do not compel."[18]

This indication of the persuasive power of the rich, along with Grodekov's previously quoted remark concerning the presence in the aul of poor people hired as workers, paves the way to a consideration of the distinctions between rich and poor in connection with the yearly round of economic life.

Such distinctions were very marked. It was primarily the wealthy and middle class herd owners who migrated with their animals, taking along with them a large number of herdsmen and shepherds. These, according to my informants, were of two kinds: first, poor relatives of the cattle owner, members of his own uru, who worked for him without pay and toward whom he stood in a patriarchal relation as their patron and protector; and second, hired workers of another uru who received wages. Rudenko writes:[19]

[15] *Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 109–10.
[16] *Idem*, 110.
[17] *Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 110.
[18] See also Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 314.
[19] *Ocherk Byta . . . Kazakov*, 20.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

It is clear that there has been a marked change in the herding economy in general during the last few centuries, which has of course been much accelerated during recent generations. Asfendiarov[28] remarks on the increasing restriction of the Kazak nomads during the eighteenth century by the expansion of Russia on the north, China in the east and the sedentary influence of the khanates of Bokhara and Kokand in the south. Because of the growth of settled areas it became no longer possible for the nomads to find new pastures during periodic crises due to drought. A struggle therefore developed among the various Kazak groups for the possession of the available lands, with a consequent elimination of the weaker groups. Those who succumbed in this process became hired herdsmen, caravan drivers, turned to agriculture, or went to the cities. Simultaneously the increasing restriction of pasture lands produced a decline of horse culture and an increase of sheep and goat herding. The herding of horses on a large scale was restricted to the rich and powerful, while small horned cattle became the basis of the economy of the poor and semi-settled people. This tendency was further stimulated by the increased demand for wool from the Central Asian markets which made sheep raising profitable. These historical observations receive confirmation from Levshin who observed[29] that at the time of his visit (about 1825) the Kazak in general possessed few horned cattle. He was told that a hundred years previously they had had none at all.

This increase of sheep raising made the autumn, when the shearing was done, a busy time. During this period the social groupings of the summer period of migration remained substantially the same. Although shearing usually took place not far from the site of the winter quarters, it was carried on by groups of a few families as in the case of the summer herding. The poor relatives and hired workers who served the large herd owners in the summer were engaged in clipping the sheep and in making general preparation for winter. This period lasted from August or the first part of September through October, when most groups moved into their winter quarters.

The dwellings for the winter were permanent structures of wattle, adobe, sod, or, more rarely, of wood or stone. They were usually called qɒstav but by some groups of the Great Orda, tam. Generally they consisted of one room but those of the rich might contain several. Adjoining the qɒstav were a number of fenced-in sarai, or corrals, surrounded with mud or wattle walls where the animals were kept. There were separate corrals for each kind of animal and sometimes a stable as well, built like the qɒstav and frequently connected with it. There were also storage places for the winter's supply of hay. Thus around each qɒstav were numerous outbuildings.

In winter the entire uru group and other people associated with it, who during the summer season had been broken up into units of a few families, lived together. Each family as a general rule had its own qɒstav so that the winter quarters of a moderate sized group formed a village of several hundred houses as well as outbuildings and corrals.

During the winter season work was not onerous. It consisted largely in caring for the

[28] *Istoriia Kazakstana*, 86-95.

[29] *Description des hordes*, 409.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

221 During the winter season work was not onerous. It consisted largely in caring for its
621 animals, and in carrying water from the adjacent springs, lake or river. An adequate water supply, in addition to a sheltered location, was the chief requirement of a good site for winter quarters. At this time also there was some work done by individuals specializing as blacksmiths and carpenters.

There appears to have been a significant number of the group, roughly twenty percent according to my information, who spent the entire year in the winter quarters. These people, having few if any animals of their own, occupied themselves in cutting hay in the meadows of their wealthy patrons or, where agriculture had developed, in tending small plots of their own. In addition hunting was for them an important economic resource. A similar observation is made in the handbook *Kasakstan i Kirgiziia*:[30]

> The poor people having no possibility to journey, remain at the kstau the year round. In some cases where agriculture is being taken seriously they are tied to the kstau for harvesting and making hay . . . .

It should be noted, however, that according to my informants it was not necessarily the same twenty percent of the people each year who stayed in winter quarters during the summer, although there appears to have been a definite tendency toward adopting a sedentary life.

The development of permanent habitations for winter occupancy is comparatively recent among the Kazak. On the other hand the practice of spending each winter in the same place in a spot well sheltered and well watered is very ancient and general among all the Central Asiatic nomadic groups. The *Tarikh-i-Rashidi*[31] has a reference to the Kazak setting out for their winter quarters in the year 919 [1513–14 A.D.]. This need not, however, indicate that these winter quarters were the substantial dwellings found among
[342] most Kazak groups today. At the present time, according to Tlenshiev, there is a group named Adaj in the southern Urals who built no qɨstav but lived in kibitkas all the year. My informants, however, considered this as a fact worthy of remark and were all somewhat amused by such backwardness. Kuftin writes:[32]

> Some Kazaks spend the winter in the same yurt [kibitka], only digging it into the ground and inner-lining it with a second coat of felt on the inside, but such Kazaks are found in the southern desert part of the country in very small numbers.

The Kazak in the Altai occupied kibitkas the year round only thirty or forty years ago.[33]

221 Likewise the habit of laying in fodder for the use of the cattle in winter is quite recent.
233 Levshin notes[34] that the Kazak near the border of Russian territory were in his time beginning to store up winter supplies, and also to provide artificial shelters for their

[30] *Kazakstan i Kirgiziia*, 9.
[31] Muhammad Haidar, *The Tarikh-i-Rashidi*, 277.
[32] *Kirgiz-Kazaki*, 35.
[33] Rudenko, *Ocherk Byta . . . Kazakov*, 32.
[34] *Description des hordes*, 312.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

POLITICAL GROUPINGS

LOCAL ADMINISTRATION

Kazak political groupings may be considered from the point of view first of local administration and second of larger units. The local political group was normally the aul, and consisted, as said above, of an uru in its functional sense of related family groups living and migrating together, plus individuals such as hired workers, slaves and relatives on the maternal side who belonged by birth to other uru but resided among the first. The larger units which may be called "tribes" consisted of rather loose and constantly shifting confederations of local groups and should not be confused with the term "tribe" as sometimes applied to the more inclusive genealogical strata. Closely related uru might be found in different and hostile tribal confederations.

Local administration lay in the hands of officials, or rather more accurately, outstanding individuals, known as bij and aqsaqal. It is difficult to distinguish accurately in practice between these two dignitaries; my informants tended to use the terms interchangeably. Strictly speaking the bij was a judge who administered the customary law, while the aqsaqal was the director and administrator of the economic life of the group. He supervised the occupancy of grazing lands and chose the routes and dates for migrations. Bij is sometimes confused with another title, bek or beg, which, according to my informants, was a general honorary term applied to rich powerful men, the owners of large herds.[1] Aqsaqal, meaning literally "white beard," is said by Begaliev and Gavrilov[2] to be used as "oldest in the gens," "elder," as well as "overseer," the sense in which I employ it. The process of the extension of its meaning here is obvious. Tlenshiev said bek might be synonomous with aqsaqal.

My informants also classed the molda[3] as an administrative official. To him were referred cases involving the shariat, or Moslem law, in distinction to those covered by the old common law.[4]

There are faint suggestions of a religious function having formerly appertained to the aqsaqal in his capacity of being in theory, if not actually, the oldest of the uru. Zaleskie[5] mentions "certain ceremonies and prayers" which he recited on the occasion of marriages, and Levshin[6] reports that before setting off on a war or raiding expedition the "chief

[1] See Lansdell, *Russian Central Asia*, 310, who says that in the south bek is used instead of bij. Begaliev and Gavrilov distinguish between the two, defining bij as "judge" and bek as "feudal lord" or "prince" (*Kazakśko-Russkiĭ Slovar'*, 43, 46).

[2] *Kazakśko-Russkiĭ Slovar'*, 27.

[3] "Mullah," Mohammedan priest, teacher, learned man.

[4] Arabic: adat; Kazak: zaŋ.

[5] *La Vie des steppes*, 24.

[6] *Description des hordes*, 373–74.

INTER-GROUP RELATIONS

The main aspects of relations between the various local groups have been considered in the previous section. Here we may mention certain cultural patterns which influenced the relations of individual members of one group with those of another.

It has been noted above in discussing the nature of social groups that an uru of more or less close blood relatives in the male line usually had living and migrating with them members of other blood groups. It is pertinent to consider their status more closely.

My informants said that if a man did not like his own uru he might go and live with another. This they seemed to think was true in more recent times but would not have been so "originally." However, even though he went to live with another group and joined their community, he would still be considered as belonging to the group into which he was born. He might then marry a girl of the uru among whom he was living but could not take a wife from the group to which he belonged by birth. Grodekov[1] expresses this by saying: "Transference from one tribe to another is not possible but living and migrating among a foreign tribe is permissable." Rudenko[2] observes that an immigrant to an alien group may be entitled to call himself by their name even though not related to them by blood, thus: "Kazaks coming from another tribe do not lose their tribal origin. For example an Argyn . . . who has joined the Karatai gens bears the name of Karatai but may nevertheless marry any Karatai girl."

I was not able to find any instances illustrating the uru affiliation of the children of such marriages. Tlenshiev said that technically they would be considered as belonging to their father's original group and a son would be permitted to marry into the uru among which he was born. But after a few generations "people would become confused" and the descendants of the original immigrant might come to be considered blood members of the group among which they were living.

Several categories may be distinguished among those residing in the group who were not its blood members in the male line. The most numerous appear to have been composed of hired workers, servants and artisans. These were the people who, having little or no property of their own and no strong patron to support them, were obliged to make a precarious living by selling their services to others. They tended to become semi-permanently attached to the group, though sometimes they went off to seek employment elsewhere. The artisans, chiefly carpenters and blacksmiths, were rather more independent than the unskilled hired herdsmen, since their knowledge of a trade assured them of being able to make their way wherever they went. In former times the slaves also formed a numerous group of

[1] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 27.
[2] *Ocherk Byta . . . Kazakov*, 59-60.

In former times the slaves also formed a numerous group

permanent residents among the uru members, except for such of them as might be ransomed or freed for other reasons. Their children would also be slaves of the same owners. Here, in a slightly different status, must be included the slaves and maid-servants who formed part of the dowries of wealthy brides. In the unlikely event of their mistress being sent back to her parents they would perhaps return with her.

In a quite different economic class were individuals who, while not blood members of the group, might own and occupy land for fodder and winter quarters among them.[3] They were mostly rather wealthy cattle owners who were obliged to supplement their hay-fields and to find better or more extensive winter shelter for their herds. In some, and perhaps in most, cases they were related to the uru members through the female line.[4]

Children might be brought up by the mother's group. Grodekov[5] writes:

> Children enjoy protection from the mother's tribe when the father's is inactive or absent. In that case when the father is of the tribe of, say, Chumbe, and the child is educated by the mother's tribe, Dzhappac, he is called among them Dzhappac [compare Rudenko's statement above] to avoid coldness of relations . . . [but] no one may belong to his mother's tribe.

Grodekov further indicates that a group may have a legal claim on daughters of its female members by birth:

> If a father dies without relatives, the children go to the mother's tribe. The son may choose whether to go or not, and may take up a trade but the girl is obliged to go since they claim her by law.

There is no further light on this point. It seems contradictory to other information.

There might be children other than those whose mothers had belonged to the group adopted by families within it. Usually, however, adopted children were taken from a brother's family, and therefore were by birth uru members. I have no satisfactory information on whether or not they would be considered as uru members if born outside but formally adopted into it.

A wife's kinsmen might in some cases come and live with her in her husband's group. Grodekov says[6] that a widower may go to live with his married daughter, but only with the permission of his son-in-law. One of my informants remarked that if a girl married well into a rich family her own kinsmen might be expected to spend a large part of their time visiting her.

In enumerating the foreign elements resident among the uru group there must also be included the free-lance warriors and the Telengut who served the powerful local chiefs and khans.

All the categories mentioned above were more or less permanently attached to the

[3] See also Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 15.
[4] Grodekov, *Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 15, 37; Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 314.
[5] *Op. cit.*, 37.
[6] *Kirgizy i Kara-kirgizy*, 35.

2: Hudson E-4, 5 (1936) 1938 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

various local groups. Transients of course were numerous. Levshin[7] mentions that in some places a fiancé who had paid the first part of the kalym might pitch his kibitka in the camp of his betrothed and live there until the transaction had been completed and he was able to take her home. Since the payments might sometimes be extended over a period of several years the prospective bridegroom perhaps became a fixture about the camp.

In addition there were large numbers of itinerant visitors, travelers, merchants, and wandering mullahs. Beggars formed a large group to whom it was considered meritorious to make gifts.[8]

All these alien elements went far to increase the complexity of social groupings and to obscure the sharp demarcation between uru groups.

HOSPITALITY

The custom of hospitality (qonaqaçь) to strangers may be noted in its connection with inter-group relations.

In principle any passing traveler was entitled to stop at any man's kibitka and remain indefinitely. One of my informants said: "He doesn't have to pay and can stay as long as he likes; the owner of the house will never tell him to go." The host was responsible for the welfare of his guest and might be obliged to pay damages equivalent to those for murder for any stranger who succumbed to starvation or exhaustion even in the vicinity of the camp.[9]

Apparently such open hospitality was liable to prove a burden because Grodekov remarks[10] that the Kazak always avoided camping near roads or frequented routes in order to obviate a deluge of ravenous guests and "if it is necessary to camp near a road they conceal themselves behind a hill."

In addition to thus escaping the responsibilities of hospitality, the custom was in practice considerably limited by two factors.

Although in theory anyone, even an enemy, was entitled to hospitality, my informants said that such an instance would never arise. One usually stopped only at places where one had some expectation of finding a welcome.

A more important limitation was that in practice hospitality was restricted to members of one's own class. The rich entertained the rich and the poor sought shelter with the poor. The poor man would probably not be turned away from the rich man's door but where the duties of hospitality were ceremonially observed for an important guest by cutting the throat of a sheep, which was afterwards eaten, a humble visitor would receive only milk or tea. The gauging of hospitality by the importance of the guest is mentioned

[7] *Déscription des hordes*, 360.

[8] See also Levshin, *op. cit.*, 344; Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 222–23.

[9] Dingelstedt, *Le Droit coutumier*, 215–18.

[10] *Kirgizy i Karakirgizy*, 110.

[271 cont.]

All this was true, but no one paid any attention to it because no one in Orenburg believed in Nurali's sincerity, and the new government, being prejudiced against him, believed the re-establishment of peace in the horde to be impossible without changing its administration, or at least without a new khan.

Baron Igelstrom's first choice for a new khan was Kaip, son of Sultan Batyr, who had reigned in Khiva and was driven out for his rapaciousness and cruelty. We have spoken of him several times, as well as of his father. The central government could not ignore the acts of hostility committed by this sultan against the Russians, nor his conduct in Khiva, and therefore his election was put off until more detailed information could be collected concerning him (1). And in the end it did not take place (2).

1. Rescript from the Empress to Baron Igelstrom of November 25, 1785.

2. A similar rescript of November 12, 1786.

Kaip was proposed for this position twice. The first proposal was brought about by two plans drawn up by Baron Igelstrom, who had firmly decided to introduce a new form of government in the Little Horde.

In one of these plans he proposed to divide the horde into three sections, according to the number of its descent lines, namely those of Semirod, Baiulin, and Alimul, and to give each a khan, but to limit the authority of these new chiefs so that they would bear only an honorary title and be, in effect, only the executors of the commands of the supreme head of the government of Orenburg.

[272] The other plan was to abolish the position of khan in the Little Horde completely and gradually to apply to them the code given by Catherine for the administration of guberniyas.

This last thought was drawn from one of the cherished as well as most remarkable works of the Empress, and thus it was especially commended and confirmed in St. Petersburg.

[301 cont.]
643 adopted the names of the Great (1), the Middle, and the Little
173

1. The other hordes regard the Great Horde as the oldest.

161 Horde. Tradition also has it that the difference in population of
631 the groups was caused by war and varying success, and as the divisions gradually increased, each one divided into several descent lines which took the names of their chiefs or kept the names of their ancient ancestors, such as the Naimans, the Kipchaks, etc. The descent lines were subdivided in turn into tribes, and the latter into sections, the sections into branches, and the branches into parts. It is almost impossible to enumerate all these subdivisions. The work necessary (2) for such an enterprise would

[115]

2. What zeal and love for genealogy one would need to have to decide to verify and examine the reports of the Kazaks! One says that his tribe is divided into five or six sections. Another asserts that it is divided into twelve. A [302] third confuses the sections of his tribe with those of the neighboring tribes. Finally, a fourth, who is more honest than any of the others, frankly admits his ignorance.

require too much patience and, above all, a long sojourn among the Kazaks, not only in every tribe or section, but also in every part of a section.

●621 Thus we will limit ourselves to enumerating the descent
631 lines and the tribes, beginning with the Little Horde, as the
611 closest to Europe. We base ourselves on Tevkelev's memoirs
[114] written more than a century ago. (See the historical section [not translated]). In the opinion of the Kazaks themselves, the information contained in these memoirs is worthy of the greatest confidence, both by their precision and by the circumstances under which they were written.

reasonably be expected to persist over time and which indicate probable vulnerabilities to psychological warfare.

COMMUNICATIONS

Because psychological warfare depends ultimately upon the ability to communicate, the existing patterns and facilities for communication have been given considerable attention in the report. These data are concerned not only with radio communications, literacy rates, and similar factors of importance in communicating from a distance, but also with motion pictures and book publishing, which are important during consolidation operations. Such scanty data as are available are given on the distribution of ethnic groups in the republic as a whole and within cities, a matter of importance in helping to define the limits of informal or word-of-mouth communication. Even more scanty, but highly important, are the few available indications of the direction and amount of uncontrolled flow of Turkic peoples back and forth between the USSR and Afghanistan, Iran, and other countries.

COLLECTIVIZATION

Among the many characteristics of Kazakh culture which have stood in the way of successful adaptation to Soviet policy, their centuries-old dedication to a life of pastoral nomadism has consistently created the most acute problems—problems which became disastrous for the Kazakhs during the collectivization drive of the 1930's. For generations the Kazakhs had led their flocks of sheep and goats in a yearly round between winter and summer grazing areas, traveling in bands whose members were united by bonds of kinship and led by the senior men. Like so many nomads they were proud of their way of life and viewed agriculture and the sedentary life it implies as both unmanly and degrading. The small amount of farming which was occasionally done was performed by women, who have always occupied a subordinate position in Kazakh society, and by slaves and the poor.

The determination of the Soviet regime to settle the Kazakhs, along with the other peoples of the USSR, on collective farms met with resistance and cost hundreds of thousands of Kazakhs their livelihood and their lives. The net loss in Kazakh population in the period 1926-1939 amounted to almost one million; if one takes into account the normal increase otherwise to be expected during this time (based on figures for the USSR as a whole) the figure is closer to one and a half million.

Some compromises were made during the later phases of collectivization, but the basic conflict remains and manifests itself in a number of different ways. The Kazakhs are among those affected by a plan for massive cultural change which the Soviets believe will eventually create a society uniformly organized in accordance with "socialist reality." Thus far, however, cultural change in Kazakhstan has failed in many ways to proceed according to plan.

may even place the authority in the hands of an adult son, if he has one, or a brother. Recourse to such action may be taken only rarely, but it is nevertheless a recognized delimitation of paternal powers. The parental authority over the son serves as the model for all authority patterns in Kazakh society, such as those involving the village elder, the clan leader, the beg, and the khan.[1]

In the past the parental authority was limited in another sense; the family was part of a village which camped and pastured its herds in common. The leaders of the village decided when and where to camp, when to change camp, when to break up the winter concentration of herds and families and move to the more dispersed spring and summer pastures.[2] A family head disobeyed these decisions at his risk. It was to his interest to follow them, since he gained many things thereby: fellowship, social position, protection from dangers by weight of numbers, assistance in time of need. The village in turn was subordinate to the clan authority if there was one. In case of raids, feuds, or other breaches of the peace, a village leader would appeal to the clan chief for aid. In a dispute between villages, a village elder would appeal to his clan chief for a judgment in his favor.

The village elder was the judge of his community, and decided all cases, usually with the support of the other senior men of the village. Appeals from their decisions were rare, defiance of their decisions even rarer. Behind the judgment of the village leader and the other elders lay the force of social solidarity, the weight of the entire village; defiance meant ejection and flight. Defiance of father by the son had similar consequences. The ultimate authority rested with the khan, if there was one, and if he cared to use his power, for he backed his authority with an army and the right of punishment by death or imprisonment, in addition to the force of his position.

The Kazakh household could include several wives if the position and wealth of the master allowed it. In one community studied, the Adai lineage on Mangyshlak peninsula, half the men had only one wife and half had two. In general, very few families contained more than two wives, although there is in theory no upper limit on the number of wives (exclusive of concubines) that a man can have. The ideal number of wives in princely families was considered to be five or nine—in contrast to the ideal number of wives for Moslems which the Koran gives as four. The family and marriage patterns of the Kazakhs are among the traits which give a pronouncedly non-Islamic coloring to their society.[3]

A youth was given his own tent and appurtenances when he came of age; traditionally he was soon to be married, and in fact a substantial number were married by the time they were 20 years old. Even as late as 1926, 222 out of every 1,000 males were married by that age, and in former years the rate was higher. The tent was not identical with the household unit. A young married couple with children did not

[1] Izvestiev, 1877, pp. 5, 11.
[2] Radloff (104), 1993, p. 513; Rudenko *et al*, 1930, pp. 4-8.
[3] Karutz (73), 1910, p. 42.

live as an independent unit, even though they had their own tent; the group was still part of the husband's father's household.[1]

Extensive studies done in the early 1920's by Rudenko describe the family life among Kazakhs of the Middle Horde. In one aul or nomadic village, there were 13 tents in a line. Five of the 13 "belonged" to the head of the aul, and of these three contained women; that is, three were tents of married persons, for women received tents only on marriage. Rich auls were small, with few families; poor auls were large, with many families joining in their poverty. One such poor aul contained 60 families; Samoilovich describes a richer grouping of 505 tents in 100 auls of three to eight tents each.[2]

Very little information is available on the size of households or the extended family. Samoilovich gave 2,408 as the number of individuals living in the 505 tents, or 4.76 per tent.[3] Equating tents with married couples, but also allowing for bachelors and childless couples in some tents, one can infer a high fertility in this particular community. This account is one of the very few detailed demographic pictures of a small community of Kazakhs living in the traditional fashion. It is difficult to generalize from such a description, but one gets a sense of the direction such figures are likely to take.

In Turkic nomad communities there are generally fewer women than men; a ratio of 900 females to 1,000 males exists among Kazakhs. The Kirgiz and the Yakut of Northern Siberia present a similar picture. Among these people, however, men tend to marry late in life, while social norms dictate that women marry early. This is shown by the fact that, in 1926, 41 out of every 1,000 Kazakh males reached the age of 40 unmarried, while only three out of every 1,000 women were still single at 40. More than 75 per cent of the women married by the age of 20; Kazakh men reached that percentage only in the age group 30-34. Hence there is actually a surplus of women seeking marriage, and this allows for a certain amount of polygamy, since a woman will marry a man who already has a wife rather than remain unmarried.

As noted before, the extended family is patriarchal in character; authority is vested in the senior male of the household. All decisions rest with him, and rarely can appeal be made beyond his word. The entire society centers around the father-son axis, the central point of the marriage life and family happiness is the bearing of a son. The son is the assurance that the line will be continued; on a larger scale, this pattern of descent in the paternal line is the web that holds the society together. This is an extreme case of a father-son oriented society. Few of the factors which tend to modify strict patriarchal control in other societies can be seen here. The Chinese and the Japanese have a patrilineal family system, but in these societies, although the father is the center of authority, the mother is the center of a different circle of emotion, one of love and warmth, and the family life involves both circles.

[1] USSR Census 1926, vol. 54.
[2] Rudenko *et al*, 1930, p. 311.
[3] Samoilovich, in Rudenko *et al*, 1930.

This distinction made between Batyr Srym and Kenesary by Soviet historians reflects the current Soviet attitude toward past leaders. These early khans who are now denounced are the national and cultural heroes of the Kazakhs. They are celebrated in the folk literature, the poetry, and the tales which parents tell their children; they are the basis of common comparisons ("as brave as . . ., as clever as . . ."). For the Kazakhs these figures are symbols of their unity as a people. Moreover, they are the ancestors of those living today, according to the traditional Kazakh ties of descent and blood. In denouncing them, the Soviets are denouncing and insulting the very people most venerated by the Kazakhs, aristocrats and commoners alike.

The hold of the olden khans still continues after more than 30 years of Soviet rule. The Kazakh native writers demonstrate a profound desire to seize upon these old figures for literary and historical themes. They stubbornly resist relinquishment of these themes when the official line changes anew. Despite three years of the sharpest attacks and polemics, adulation of the ancient heroes continues in the literature, in films, in classroom textbooks, in official histories; its eradication is a concern of the Soviet regime today.[1]

KAZAKH LIFE IN 1950

The preceding description of the traditional Kazakh society and culture was included not only as background to the present, but primarily because whole sectors of Kazakhs continue more or less unchanged in that way of life, even though they are now members of a collective farm. Traditional Kazakh culture includes forces which have blocked accommodation to the Soviet pattern and forces which have permitted Sovietization. These forces will be taken up in turn.

In rural Kazakhstan, Kazakhs live in collective farms either as herders or as combined herders and farmers. They form the greater proportion of the population in the regions which are primarily devoted to herding, western and west-central Kazakhstan. Here they continue the old nomad life, pasturing their herds of sheep, goats, horses, cattle, and camels from winter camp to summer, reversing their path and completing the cycle in the fall. The winter camps are the focal points of community life, the stable centers of the annual round. Here after the summer dispersal the Kazakhs return to large adobe houses, structures which contain not only quarters for the extended family, but also stables, connecting corridors, and rooms for the storage of hay. Some of these house-stable-barn structures are a century old; it was about one hundred years ago that domiciles of this type were introduced into the area.[2]

The extended families and villages have been the basis of Kazakh adaptation to Sovietization. Kazakh herders continue to live in kin units, with the old aul or nomadic village as the core of the herding

[1] *Pravda*, 26 Dec 50, 19 Apr 51, and 28 Oct 52; *Voprosy Istorii*, 1951, No. 4, pp. 3-15.
[2] Kurbo and Makhova, 1952, pp. 43-45.

kolkhoz. On the other hand, those Kazakhs who have changed from herding to farming live in villages which are no longer kin communities. The background of this differentiation antedates the Revolution, and is an important part of Kazakh developments during the last hundred years.

In the period from 1850 to 1917 the Russians gradually took over the more fertile sections of the steppe in the north, especially along lake shores and river banks, and in mountain piedmont. This left less steppe, and less fertile steppe, for the rapidly increasing Kazakh population. The impoverished Kazakhs were impelled to take up agriculture, which requires less territory per individual than does herding; in regions having sufficient annual rainfall to support cultivation, farming is a more efficient use of the land and hence permits greater density of population. Where the Kazakhs were thus forced to take up agriculture, they tended to break up the kinship units. The agricultural villages are larger than the nomadic, and are composed of broken clans, broken lineages, villages, and families.

Many Kazakh communities survived this impact and managed to maintain their herding pattern, usually in conjunction with a certain minimum amount of farming, which was done in the vicinity of the winter camp by the women and the poor. Communities of this kind comprise the norm to this day; farming among such villages and kolkhozy is largely concerned with raising feed for the livestock. These communities have, as a general rule, gone over bodily into the collective farm system. One such collective farm is the Belbasar Kolkhoz in the Dzhambul region, in the valley of the Chu River. This farm is composed of 116 households; of these 100 are Kazakh, all of the same lineage, the Akhsha lineage of the Dulat clan of the Great Horde. Of the remaining households, 13 are Azerbaijani, two are Russian, and one is a Kazakh who came to this kolkhoz from the Middle Horde in 1942 as a blacksmith. The head of one of the Russian families is a carpenter, the other a kolkhoz leader.[1]

This collective farm in the south appears in striking contrast to those in the north, in the farming zone of the Semipalatinsk region, for example, where Kazakh clan and lineage affiliations are mixed and confused. The Kazakhs of southeast Kazakhstan know their horde and clan affiliations; they are all of the Great Horde, and of one of four clans. Korbe compiled a list of 11 collective farms in this area in which the core population consisted of members of a specific lineage of a specific clan. It thus seems clear that in this part of Kazakhstan the anvil upon which the collective farm pattern was hammered out was the descent group and the kin village. Here, then, is a Kazakh institution which served as a means of accommodation to the Soviet pattern.[2]

The kin village and lineage were the channels through which the Kazakh herdsmen passed into the collective farm life. That the passage was made indicates the force which these institutions have even today.

The traditional function of the nomadic village was to organize the annual movements of the member families as a collective enterprise

[1] Korbe, 1950, p. 71.
[2] Ibid., pp. 71-72.

under the direction of the village leader. The leader and the elders decided all questions concerning village activities. The administration of justice was in the hands of the elders, while the enforcement of decisions was a common village enterprise; thus the village peace was kept. The raw framework of the village collectivity moved as a unit into the Soviet era.

The Kazakh lineage supplied the basis for the practice of marrying outside the group. The lineage occupied a common territory, and during the course of the past century the unit of common residence rather than the unit of descent and kinship has served to regulate marriage. Wives are sought outside the village; girls leave their native villages to join their husband's people, although this may not involve moving a great distance. The lineage is today generally identical with the village, and under the Soviet regime, with the collective farm. There is today the practice of kolkhoz exogamy.[1]

The practice of polygamy has likewise proved compatible with Soviet conditions. In former times, the many-wived family was the family of the well-born, the rich, the influential; today, the many-wived family is that of the village leader, the kolkhoz president, the brigade foreman. The leviratic marriage of the widow to the brother of the deceased or to another close kinsman has also accommodated itself to Soviet conditions, within the framework of the extended family, for among the peoples of the steppe this practice depends upon and reinforces the extended family structure. In Kazakhstan, the extended family rests on the close integration of several fraternal households and the conjugal families of a father and his sons and at times even grandsons.

The Soviet ideological campaign has directed attention to the practice of polygamy among leading elements in Kazakh collective farms; similarly, a number of reports indicate that leviratic marriage is still practiced. Soviet ethnographers do not discuss these institutions from the standpoint of the functions of the Kazakh extended family and the Kazakh village community. Instead, they have made a political issue out of what they are pleased to call the survival of the feudal mores. But they choose to ignore the fact that the practices which they condemn are part and parcel of the existing family and village system.

The status of women in Kazakhstan is a serious question to Soviet ideologists. In 1944, in 1949, and again in 1951, the Kazakh Party leadership was briefed by the Central Committee in Moscow regarding the participation of Kazakhs, of Kazakh women, and of literate and educated people in the Kazakh Communist Party (see Chapter 6, which deals with the Party). That the program has evidently fallen short of plan is suggested by the repetition of the instructions. The Kazakhs are not coming forward for training in Party work, despite the fact that they are periodically encouraged to do so, and despite the prestige and material advantages of Party membership. And the women lag behind the men in this respect.

Woman's position in Kazakh society, and the Soviet failure to understand the background of this position, has important consequences in the

[1] Ibid., p. 86.

it out. The attempts by the Soviet regime to cause the Kazakhs to conform to their plan are trial and error procedures which sometimes succeed, sometimes fail. They work where the Kazakhs accept, they fail where the Kazakhs are able to reject Soviet culture. Where the Kazakhs accept, it is because they already possessed cultural institutions similar to those which the Soviet regime wished them to have. The ease with which the Kazakh family and village organization moved over into the collective farm structure illustrates this. Both the traditional Kazakh and the Soviet village and rural family are based on close internal cooperation; the core population of both the prerevolutionary and the modern village are kinsmen.

Alternatively, the Kazakhs accept Soviet culture where their native institutions have been crushed and the Soviet institution simply imposed from above. An instance of this is the class structure and the government structure related to it. The Kazakh ruling class, the hereditary nobility, was driven out, and the corresponding form of local government collapsed. It was replaced by the present regime of Soviet functionaries and the Soviet state structure within which they take their places. It seems generally true that the small-scale institutions of the steppe peoples such as family and kinship are stabler, more constant than the larger ones, such as state and empire.[1]

The Soviet culture has been rejected by the Kazakhs where no native customs or institutions existed upon which the new pattern could be imposed. Thus the Soviet concept of a fraternity of nationalities combined to form the USSR has no place in Kazakh life. The Kazakhs have had no especially friendly relations with the Russians; on the contrary, in the 19th century they hated the Russians as colonialists and frequently rose in revolt against them. At present, relations have not improved; the Kazakhs have no reason—political, economic, or cultural—to accept the Russian regime more closely now than they did in the past. If one finds no evidence today of revolts in Central Asia, it is because Soviet control over the Kazakhs is far more efficient than that of the Tsars. And if there were revolts or other expressions of mass unrest, resentment, feelings of injustice, and the like, word of them would not reach the western world until the Soviet press chose to mention them.

The theory of controlled acculturation remains a theory, the western formulation of Soviet policy. It is in contrast with the western approach, which does not conceive of culture in terms of a controlling plan. Kazakh culture has been disrupted through incorporation into the Soviet Union; there are gaps in the fabric of their society resulting from the rapid acculturation. The traditional has not been entirely replaced by the new. Two reasons may be adduced for this: resistance by the Kazakhs, and faulty or inadequate planning by the Soviets. The deficiencies in the planning have tended to increase the degree of the resistance.

[1] Krader (77), 1963.

Chapter 5

ECONOMY

TRADITIONAL PATTERN OF KAZAKH ECONOMY

The traditional economy of the Kazakhs is herding, the raising of cattle, horses, camels, and, numerically the most important, sheep and goats. Settled life is despised, farming is despised. Herding is a nomadic way of life, but this does not mean indiscriminate wandering over the face of the earth. In the past, when all Kazakhs were nomads, each herding community had its fixed pattern of grazing, starting in the spring from the winter quarters, traveling to pastures where they spent the summer, then returning over the same path to the winter quarters again. Each community had its own territory for grazing and camping, and would fight off any intruder. Communities camped in closer proximity to each other—making for greater density of population—where there was more water and grass for the herds.[1]

The most favorable area for herding, with regard to the availability of plant cover and water, is in the northern part of the Kazakh steppe. Unfortunately, this part of the steppe is precisely the zone which is able to support a small amount of agriculture, and it was here that the Russians and Ukrainians settled in the 19th century. As a result the Kazakhs, in a period when their population was increasing, were thrust back on a more limited territory, away from the grassy steppe, away from the river and lake shores favored by the Slavs for agriculture, away from the water courses in northeastern Kazakhstan where mining, as well as agriculture, had been instituted. The steppe which remained to them was of poorer quality, for herding or for any other subsistence economy.

Faced with the problem of sustaining a herding economy with more of their number on less and poorer land, the Kazakhs began to take up agriculture. The first to go over to the new way were the poor, the marginal herders. The rich, of course, continued their pastoralism, hiring the poor to work for them. Out of this emerged a new pattern of mixed herding and farming. During the latter part of the 19th century, crops were planted at the winter quarters, and tended by the poor Kazakhs and by women, while the wealthier able-bodied men went off with the herds in the more honored occupation.

[1]For a detailed description of the Kazakh nomadic pattern, see Rudenko in Baranov, 1927.

administrative relations, hence Radlov's idea that his office was a usurpation.

The Village of the Great Horde

The aul or nomadic village (literally, enclosure) of the Kazakhs was a phenomenon of the winter season when its members gathered at the customary encampment after the summer dispersal.[86] These auls were generally composed of closely related families: such at least was the case prior to the end of the 19th century, at which time they were transformed into sedentary units with fixed localities through Russian administrative dispositions and through the increase in agriculture. In certain cases the winter camps might be composed of several auls, forming a larger grouping for mutual cooperation and protection. The concentration of people often required the removal of the herds from the main winter camp, and hence more men would be needed to guard them, making common cause, and defending each other against marauders, both human and animal, of whom the steppe was full. But the close conjunction of many Kazakhs who recognized only vague authority relations among themselves required the constant recourse to the biis[1] in the resolution of disputes.[87]

[86] Dingelstedt, 214.

[87] Radloff, op. cit., I, 513-514.

[1] [i.e. elders; cf. cat. 118, AH1 Mongolia, pp. 411-412 -- Analyst]

[Great Horde]
-419-

177 66 565 The reason is clear: the ak sŭök or white "bone" had been the political rulers in the steppe in view of their descent from Khans and illustrious exponents of Islam. While they had remained the political rulers of the Kazakhs it was important to maintain the quality of their estate by recourse to a rule of endogamy, thus preserving their [556] superiority over the black "bone." When the political meaning of the separateness disappeared,[1] the practice of endogamy between the estates disappeared; and correlated with this change was the greater emphasis on wealth for social distinction: we have seen how the bii was often chosen at this time because of his wealth rather than by birth.[2]

The ak sŭök no longer had any legal privileges; their principal mark of social distinction was in terms of respect, a special place at feasts and ceremonies, and so forth.[95] Thus the estate in the past was a political structure embodying principles of the consanguineal system of the Kazakhs. It disappeared, but the kinship system upon which it was based remained in an altered form.

624 The nomadic village was until Russian times a patrilineal kin group, a portion of a lineage. It conformed to the theory of the corporate structure advanced here

[95] Idem.

1 [Cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 414 -- Analyst]
2 [Cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 411 ff. -- Analyst]

621 by virtue of its fixed rules of admission (by birth or adoption); its perpetual life, or at any rate the survival of the life-cycle of its individual members; and its fixed locus of authority in the person of the village bii. The family community formed the core of the social grouping necessary for the nomads. Family members who stood in closest consanguinity were bound closely together through common, undivided ownership, which was a condition of life for small herds; isolated further kinsmen came to them and neighboring families connected through other relationships combined to form what Radlov has called the smallest social unit, the aul,[96] in its economic, juridical and other functions.

The Family in the Great Horde

596 The Kazakh family was an extended family: three generations of males, grandfather, father, and son, were combined in a family; such at least was the ideal case, the desideratum, achieved when conditions were favorable: the rich Kazakh of the Great Horde kept his family together and formed a veritable extended family.[97] An allotment was made to the sons on marriage among those families who could afford it, while the poor paterfamilias

[96] Radloff, op. cit., I, 513.

[97] Izrastsov, 3.

613
177.
69

[Great Horde]

681 distributed among the elders of the clan or lineage, etc.
602 The remaining half was further divided, part being dis-
613 tributed among the more distant kin of the victim; how much was thus given out was up to the family of the victim, but it was impossible to give nothing. A slighted kinsman would appeal to the elders of the community, and was given a share of the kun proportional to the closeness of kinship. The remainder was divided among the sons of the victim, or if there were none, among the next of agnatic kin.[159]

177.68 681 621 The unit for payment,[1] after the reorganisation of Kazakh society under Russian impact was the aul; despite the composition of the village at this time by segments of various lineages, it continued to act through a convenient fiction as though it were a unitary kin group. Support for payment of the kun was drawn from neighbors within the aul and from the kinsmen, both of whom were treated sociologically as a unit. If the guilty refused to pay, then the lineage or the clan, now settled in a volost', simply raided the guilty man's herds and made seizure of the requisite amount.[160]

622 602 695 The biis,[2] would often require that kin in the seventh degree of agnatic kinship take the oath in support of the accused. By this was meant, if the man were adjudged

---

159 Idem.

160 Radloff, op. cit., I, 525.

[1] [i.e. of wergeld; cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 448ff. --Analyst]

[2] [on the biji, cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, pp. 411-412 -- Analyst]

[Middle Horde]

58 reciprocal one; on coming of age, the son could make no more demands on the father; the allotment made was at the same time a quittance of further obligation.

4mp A distinction was made between the inheritance of real property and the transmission of such intangibles as authority. The father was the absolute lord in his family, and his authority passed, in accordance with the principle of primogeniture, to the eldest son, or lacking a son, to a brother of the deceased. Related families were gathered into villages, aul, and a village elder, or bii, generally had a position of influence in public affairs, and a limited amount of authority in intra-family matters. Thus there was a limitation on the paternal power.

62 The leadership of a sub-lineage, a village, or a [428] family, passed in the direct line through the eldest sons.[168] The status of bii some decades later, in the 1860's, is described as quasi-hereditary, and a case is cited by Valikhanov in which it remained in one family through four generations.[169] The office later came to be appointive, and only quasi-hereditary.

695 Among these Kazakhs of the Middle Horde, one means
682 of settling disputes is reported as having especial promi-
584

168 von Lebedour, II, 459-461.

169 Valikhanov, 162.

[Little Horde - Mangyshlak Kazaks]

613 generations.

Finally, attention should be drawn to the workings of another structural principle: the ranking of the minor or sub-lineages according to the priority of birth of the founder by virtue of the principle of differential inheritance and succession.

The Village in the Little Horde

•621 Meyendorff made a journey from Orenburg in the southern Ural mountains to Bukhara in the year 1820. In the territory of the Little Horde he encountered a village which was the camp of a great Kazakh chief. By comparison with other villages, Meyendorff accounted this one a large village, containing fifty tents, grouped in clusters of from three to six tents each. He passed through this aul in the month of October, presumably when these pastoralists had gathered together in their winter camp after the summer dispersal.[181]

Radlov has reported that the typical Kazakh aul was composed of from fifty to seventy tents;[182] here it is

---

[181] Meyendorff, 14.

177.62 621 [182] Radloff, Aus Sibirien, I, 518. By Radlov's day there had already taken place the administrative reform mentioned above, namely, the reorganization of villages into volosti integrated into the Turkestan governor-generalcy. By then, too, the office of village elder had become appointive, and was no longer an expression of prestige through birth or wealth alone.

621 necessary to distinguish between tents and families, contrary to the identification made by the estimates and censuses. Radlov's data are offered as being general for the Kazakhs; they are the result of his studies and travels in the latter third of the 19th century, presumably referring to the winter camps. Meyendorff's figure is for what he considered a large aul, nevertheless it falls within the lower limit of Radlov's range. In the interim the Kazakhs took up agriculture to an even greater extent; there is no difficulty therefore in accepting the validity of both observations, in fact they tend to corroborate each other. The neighboring Kalmuks had winter groupings of similar size, and from these various considerations we may derive a picture of an aul in the western steppe.

622 556 The relation of such an aul to the question of kinship has already been proposed: they were in general groupings of families agnatically related to each other. Meyendorff's account further points up the relationship between the Kazakh aul and wealth. A rich Kazakh attracted to himself wider and wider circles of kin and formed his own village, and in this connection Meyendorff cites a line in a song, "See this aul which is that of a wealthy man." Again, we are endebted to Meyendorff for the observation that the village elder or aksakal was usually a man of substance, with a large family.[183]

[183] Meyendorff, 45-47.

[Little Horde]

622 Compare the villages of the Great Hordo, where a village
632 head or elder was the one with the greatest number of kinsmen to support his point of view--in those cases where a village was not consanguineally related in a homogeneous manner.

•624 Thus auls among the Kazakhs of the Little Horde and elsewhere were headed by men of wealth as well as by men of rank through birth: the case of the aul of fifty tents mentioned above was the aul of a nobleman of the Little Horde. There remains the question of the composition of the clusters of from three to six tents noted by Meyendorff. These were in all likelihood family groups composed of a father, his wife or wives, who would then get separate tents, and his married sons and their children; possibly also tents of servants, or dependent kinsmen, etc. Karutz has given a schematic description of the Kazakh aul, identical with that of the Turkmen: The Turkmen and Kazakhs live in auls, clusters of tents based on family or lineage relationship; the tents are ranged either in a straight line or in a gentle curve open to the south. The consanguineal principle in aul formation is further noted in the fact that there may be as few as two tents in an aul, one for a father and his wife, and one for a married son. This is probably

er of summer camps than winter, however, because of

184 Karutz, Unter Kirgisen und Turkmenen, 65.

62) the greater degree of concentration in the winter. Rad-
[103] lov has given the etymology of aul from agyl, enclosure, cognate with the Mongol ayil. The Mongol ayil was indeed a circle, according to the descriptions of Shchapov for the Buryats, Pozdneev for the Khalkha Mongols, and Vladimirtsov for the Mongols of earlier times. That of the Little Horde Kazakhs and of the Turkmen, their neighbors to the south, had apparently opened out; the same is true of the Kalmuk nomadic village.

The Family in the Little Horde

596 The data bring out a number of features shared by the Little Horde families with other Kazakh and Turco-Mongol groups. The family was agnatic, it was patrilocal in residence, and it was of the extended family type, that is, the family into which one was born was the same as that which one procreated on marriage. The extended family had a personality before the law, it extended beyond the life span of any individual member, and in general conforms with the conception of the corporate structure which has already been advanced here, apud Maine, Weber, and Fortes. The family was the unit of economic production and consumption, and it was the unit of production of children. It could become the

t of nomadic movement if it was identical with a vil-
ge. Otherwise, as we have seen, the village is the
t of nomadic movement.

ELS These descent lines formed the aristocracy, while the commoners were the estate of the kara sŭök. The distinction maintained by the end of the 19th century was no longer that of purity of descent in a particular line, but rather by wealth, between rich and poor Kazakhs.[243]

621 576 Aul and Family; Aul-Family in the Inner Horde

The lineage was composed of a number of auls whose members were agnatically related to each other more closely than to other members of the lineage. Where possible, a single extended family might form an entire aul of five to ten tents. Such an aul would be composed of a father, his married sons, their children, sometimes close collateral kin of the father, and if possible, four generations of patrilineal descent. This, however, was more often the case in the past than it was at the end of the 19th century, when sons had a greater tendency to break away on marriage--i.e., on being apportioned by the father. Authority in the aul passed to the eldest son on the death of the father. Authority was patriarchal except when, on the death of the father while the sons were still minor, the senior widow held the authority in trust, together with the entire estate, until the sons came of age.[244]

[243] Ibid., 47, 52.

[244] Ibid., 110.

[Inner Horde]

624 This pattern obtained for the lineage, for the aul, for
596 the extended family, and in those cases, a fortiori,
when any or all coalesced in one unit. The aul was the
nomadic unit, which camped, moved, and pastured its
herds together.

595 The family was polygynous, but the usual family
had but one wife, and more than two wives in a family
was virtually unknown. Two reasons are given, the kalym
was high and women were few. In the polygynous house-
hold, the first wife was in a favored position, for she
could only be punished by the husband, while she in turn
could punish the others, a distaff reflection of the
rule of patriarchal authority and of seniority. This
contrasts with the situation in the Great Horde, where
[562] the first wife had no such preferred status. On the
other hand, the wife enjoyed considerable freedom in
general, and there was something close to equality of
the spouses.[245]

428 The children of all the wives inherited equally
from the father, and both sons and daughters shared
in the estate,[246] the daughters' portions being the
settlement of a dowry. On the marriage of the first-
born son, he was usually charged with the support of
the senior wife, his mother, in keeping with the prin-

---

[245] Ibid., 107-108.

[246] Ibid., 108.

613 would also be known by the name of the Karatai sëök with which they have been fused. These Argun sub-lineage members form an exogamic unit, offering daughters as wives to other sëök of the Karatai byr top and receiving [567] wives in turn. Again, sub-lineages were formed by descendants of slaves taken from the Torguts, the Kalmuk, the Uriankhai, the Teleut, now fully incorporated. Thus, another sëök of the Karatai was the Sumar sëök, descended from a slave named Sumar captured from the Kalmuk.[267] Lineages may extend their membership, incorporate members of other corporate entities, whether Kazakh lineages, hordes, or non-Kazakh nomadic groups such as the Kalmuk, including the admission to lineage membership of the line of freed slaves; the numerical significance of this principle is not to be underestimated because of the large proportion of people taken in war, raid, etc., and set free to dwell among the captors. Lineage fusion, individual adoption and admission of freed slaves are means, other than through birth, of extending the lineage rolls.

The Aul of the Altai Kazakhs

●621 Data on village life of the Middle Horde Kazakhs of the Altai are remarkable for their detail. The nomads

---

[267] Rudenko, op. cit., 59-60.

-537-

[Altai Kazakhs]

621 556 [101] 433 The nomads in question[1A] occupied the steppe northeast of Zaisan Nur, around the uppermost course of the Cherny (Black) Irtysh, as semi-sedentary farmer-herders in the 1920's: the poorest Kazakhs dwelled in the winter camps the year round, and supported themselves by caring for their own farming plots and those of the wealthier Kazakhs and by hunting. The wealthier Kazakhs, in contrast, maintained a mixed economy, based mainly on herding, but with some farming, aided by the poorer Kazakhs. They were for the most part Naiman, with some Kereit elements among them.[268] Hence the following account of aul nomadism is to be understood as an advanced state of acculturation, and connected only to the pastoralism of moderate and wealthy Kazakhs.[2A] [177.62]

621 The aul in its several variations was entirely a kin unit among these Kazakhs. The Kazakh aul elsewhere, even at an earlier period, no longer comprised a homogeneous kin group. This was not so among the northeasternmost Kazakhs. The auls of the latter fall into two categories: the fully nomadic auls, such as those of the Kazakhs in the Kosh-Agach aimak (Oirot Autonomous Oblast');[269] and auls which are entirely sedentary, such as those of the poor Kazakhs mentioned above, members

---

[268] Ibid., 1-3, 62.

[269] Semeilovich, 312.

1A [For further background on the Altai Kazakhs, cf. Cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 523ff.--Analyst]

2A [For further data, Cf. Cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, pp. 537-544.--Analyst]

[Altai Kazakhs]

621 of the Kereit. In the Kosh-Agach aimak there were approximately 100 auls of the Middle Horde Kazakhs who were exclusively herders, with a total of 505 tents, thus averaging five tents per aul. The range was between three and eight tents per aul. The total number of people was 2408 (1123 males, and 1175 females), an average of 4.8 people per tent and 24 per aul.[270] Each aul moved as an individual unit, each was composed of close kin which in effect was a large extended family. However, their larger social units were of mixed composition, and not of more or less close agnatic kin.[271]

621/101 In the vicinity of the Black Irtysh, the bulk of the Kazakhs were of the Naiman division of the Middle Horde; they comprised most of the herding population, they were th wealthy stratum, able to support herding. Their poorer neighbors, possibly more recent arrivals, were the Kazakhs of the Kereit division of the Middle Horde, more specifically, members of the Ashmaily clan of the Kereit. They lived primarily by farming and hunting, were very poor, had no horses, only a few cattle, sheep and camels, and lived a sedentary life. In contrast to the tiny mobile auls of the pastoral Kazakhs, these sedentary Ashmaily auls numbered up to 60 tents.[272]

---

[270] Ibid., 311.

[271] Ibid., 312.

[272] Rudenko, op. cit., 61-62.

621 There is a correlation between the wealth of a Kazakh community and small size, its pastoral life requiring that it be small and mobile, and its composition by closely and homogeneously related kin. In this manner, the wealth, size, and consanguineal composition are all interrelated.

621 433 556 That the validity of this four-fold correlation is not restricted to the northeastern Kazakh domain may be seen in an example drawn from the western portion, in the old territory of the Little Horde. Here it has been reported for the same period, the 1920's, that the poorer Kazakhs took up agriculture, the richer maintained a mixed economy of herding and farming; the auls of the richer Kazakhs were composed only of close kin, while in the encampments of the poorer, two or three different, unrelated groups of kin were joined together.[273] From this we may infer a correlation between economic pursuit, wealth or poverty, and consanguineal composition of auls of the Little Horde; unfortunately, the fourth element in the correlation, that of size, cannot be confirmed for lack of data.

621 233 The Altai Mountain Kazakhs of the Middle Horde moved as a unit from winter to summer pasturage provided the aul was small; if the aul was large, it broke up into

---

[273] Ibid., 1927, 8-10; Bukei Khan, 60-62.

[Altai Kazakhs]

621 component extended family or close-kin groups for the
233 summer movement.[274] These aul, in the northeast of Kazakhstan, were disposed in a line just as those in the western parts were,[275] in contrast to the nomadic village of the Khalkhas and Buryats which was circular in form.

621 The aul of the poor were generally larger than
[556] those of the wealthy because they were sedentary, and were identical with the Kazakh winter encampment kystau/kstau, where farming was engaged in. The Kazakh summer camp dzailiau was smaller, more mobile, nomadic, pastoral, wealthier, related through close patrilineal ties. All
621 these camps bore the names of their founders. For ex-
614 ample, in the genealogy of M. Chamov cited above,[1] his paternal ancestor in the fifth ascending generation, Kuldja-Bai, was the founder of the aul of which Chamov himself was the leader. This aul founder was the great-grandson of the sŏŏk founder, Sargaldak, and the grandson of the founder of Chamov's ata, Sary, and the aul itself bore the name of Kuldja-Bai. The head of this aul was also the head of the clan, since by right of primogeniture, the two offices coincided; thus the great-grandfather ul ata of Chamov was Biuydakan.[276] It was

[274] Rudenko, 1930, 8.

[275] Ibid., 54.

[276] Samoilovich, 307.

1 [Cf. cat. 116, AHI Mongolia, p. 528 ff. --Analyst]

621 the latter who had led the great migration of the Karatai to their present pasturages.

233 The normal nomadic movements of the Kazakhs, especially those of the central and western portions of Kazakhstan, are north-south and south-north, in a yearly cycle, moving with the seasons.[277] The timing of the movements is determined by factors such as grass and weather, water and topography.[278] The influence of topography is seen from the fact that the northeastern Kazakhs, those in the Altai Mountain territory, cause their movements to conform with the relief, moving up the mountains in the summer, where the grass-growth is favored by the snow-melt.[279]

621 233 A nomadic camp moves a minimum of eight kilometers a day to about 30 kilometers a day, but not daily; quitting the winter camp toward the end of May or early June, an aul might move slowly on alternate days, or with even longer rest periods, over a period of one to three weeks, to the summer camp. The total distance from winter and summer camp is from about 45 to 100 kilometers, generally about 70 or 75. Sometimes longer rests are made en route at spring camps kokteu and fall camps kuzeu.[280]

---

[277] Rudenko, op. cit., 72.

[278] Ibid., 8.

[279] Ibid., 72.

[280] Ibid., 4-8.

2.2) These nomadic movements have been described in detail for several reasons; first, the intrinsic interest in the patterns themselves; second, for comparative purposes, since similar data exist for the Kalmuks; third, because they are germane to the kinship problem being discussed in this context. A summer camp is a dispersed unit, kinsmen move away from each other; these are close kinsmen, pastoral, relatively well-to-do Kazakhs who still maintain their herds. Under normal conditions, the factors of size of the different units, wealth in herds and amount of pasturage, will determine how many close kin will remain together over several generations, and how far off they will disperse from each other. These factors together are determinants of kinship in general insofar as they decree how many human beings can optimally live together as herders; and they are determinants in particular cases of the variations imposed by necessity on the optimal arrangements. We have seen that nomadic aul contain between three and eight families (i.e., conjugal families); they contain from one to three extended families, which are actually one extended family. The number of conjugal families in the aul of a wealthy Kazakh, or of a leader of middle rank may attain from ten to fifteen; the aul of a great leader may have as high as 50 tents or families, but these are special cases. The fact remains that the ordinary Kazakhs live in kin-communities of a fairly

621 limited size. How many kin a man has; how many will inherit from him; who will support him; whom he must support; whose wife he will take in the levirate; whose son he may adopt as his own; who will help him in pasturing his flocks; the variation is of relatively small range. All these relationships are consanguineal, and for this reason the factors of the environment play a profound role in the daily life of the Kazakhs, and impose themselves on the very kinship structure.

621 The leadership of the aul, other than that of a clan or lineage chief, was in the hands of the aksakal, as of old. In the past, the incumbency of the office was based on birth, primogeniture, or alternatively, the designation of the most able son if the first was incompetent or had quarreled with his father. Later the determination was based on wealth; but in any case, his social position was the highest in the village, and his word was decisive as a rule.[281] He settled disputes and conducted the affairs of the community generally, and presided over its religious life, in the absence of a mullah; but since mullahs were rare in this part of the Turkic world, the leading of prayers, sacrifices, etc., was generally left to the aksakal.[282] Such then was the nomadic village kin community of the northeastern Kazakhs. We

[793]

000

---

[281] Ibid., 66.

[282] Ibid., 80.

621 was that it preserved a number of features of a time[1] We
1776 when acculturation was less advanced, giving ground in others: the growth of farming and the administrative reshuffling by the Russians were the main acculturative influences, but there were other minor ones, in technology for instance, which were not without an effect on the kinship picture. The increase in the gathering and storage of hay[283] influenced the nomadic cycle of the still-pastoral Kazakhs, encouraging some to continue to be herders, lessening the scope of movement of others, factors closely bound up with kinship. On the other hand, the scythes, etc., necessary for mowing, had to be purchased from the Russians, making for an increase in commodity exchange, closer economic interaction with the Russians, and an acceleration of the acculturative process once again.

Family and Marriage

596 The Kazakh family in the 1920's was an extended family and as such continued to form the innermost of a series of concentric circles of kinship; like the next outer concentric circle, the nomadic village, and like the outermost, the lineage, it was founded on an agnatically related membership, it was patrilocal, patriarchal,

---

[283] Ibid., 24.

[1] [i.e., the nomadic village kin community of the northeastern Kazakhs (Altai Kazakhs) --Analyst]